



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,663	08/29/2001	Akiko Sato	NITT.0031	4771

38327 7590 03/31/2005

REED SMITH LLP  
3110 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, SUITE 1400  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042

EXAMINER

TANG, KUO LIANG J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2191

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/940,663	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SATO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Kuo-Liang J Tang	<b>Art Unit</b> 2191	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED \_\_\_\_\_ FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the ~~new or amended~~ claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. *in part as per amendments to the specification*  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) rejected: 13-21.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Advisory Action***

**Continuation Sheet.(PTO-303)**

Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 13-21 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

*In the Response and Amendment, the applicants argue that:*

(A) Hohle does not disclose, teach or suggest a message ID that is used when exchanging the application loading permission and for claim 13 and 19, the data of the smart card is stored using the message ID as a key and search the result using the message ID as a key (Claim 13) (see page 19, lines 4-5).

(B) Hohle shows an example of an issuer's construction and fails to show those of an issuer and a service provider (Claim 13) (see page 19, lines 24-25).

(C) Hohle does not disclose "the data of the smart card issuance/management system and the smart card service providing/managing system is stored using the message ID as a key" and "the smart card service providing/managing system searches an examination result at the time of initial loading application using the message ID as the key"(Claims 13 and 19) (see page 19, lines 28-35).

(D) Hohle does not disclose "data of the smart card issuance/management system and the smart card service providing/managing system is stored using the message ID as a key (e.g. see col. 3:61-62, initialization data (e.g., account numbers))" (Claim 16) (see page 19, lines 28-35).

**Examiner's response:**


(A) The examiner disagrees with Applicants' assertion that Hohle does not disclose, teach or suggest a message ID. In fact, Hohle does teaches initialization data (e.g. account number, serial number, default preferences, and the like) (emphasis added)(E.g. see col. 3:57-67) which is the same as the message ID in this application. These data can be used to stored and searched as a key. Further, Hohle discloses "a message ID that is used when exchanging the application loading permission" (E.g. see 3:57-67, which states "... CODUS 106 interfaces with personalization system 140 in order to facilitate reissuance of the card by providing updated data in the event a card is destroyed, lost, or stolen. Personalization system 140 is described in detail below in conjunction with FIG. 9." The examiner interprets that if the card is not initialized properly, the applications can not be loaded properly either.

(B) The examiner disagrees with Applicants' assertion that Hohle shows an example of an issuer's construction and fails to show those of an issuer and a service provider. In fact, Hohle teaches a service provider (e.g. see col. 9:58 to col. 10:9).

(C) The examiner disagrees with Applicants' assertion. In fact, Hohle teaches "the data of the smart card issuance/management system and the smart card service providing/managing system is stored using the message ID as a key (e.g. see col. 3:61-62, initialization data (e.g., account numbers))" and "the smart card service providing/managing system searches an examination result at the time of initial loading application using the message ID as the key (e.g. see col. 9:57-65 and see FIG. 9 and associated text, i.e. see col. 3:57-67)".

Art Unit: 2191

(D) The examiner disagrees with Applicants' assertion. In fact, Hohle teaches "data of the smart card issuance/management system and the smart card service providing/managing system is stored using the message ID as a key (e.g. see col. 3:61-62, initialization data (e.g., account numbers))".



TUAN DAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER